

08/19/04

AF/2155
120Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/433,188
Filing Date	Oct 25, 1999
First Named Inventor	Neault
Group Art Unit	2155
Examiner Name	NGUYEN, THU HA T

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Attorney Docket Number MS1-311US

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

- ☒ Fee Transmittal Form
 - ☐ Fee Attached
- ☐ Amendment / Reply
 - ☐ After Final
 - ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
 - ☐ Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- ☐ Assignment Papers (for an Application)
- ☐ Drawing(s) Sheets
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) _____

- ☐ After Allowance Communication to Group
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☒ Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☒ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Return Postcard

Remarks

RECEIVED

AUG 24 2004

Technology Center 2100

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENTFirm or Individual name
Frederick M. Fliegel, Reg. No. 36,138

Signature

Date

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that the items listed above as enclosed are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, in an envelope addressed to The Commissioner of Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313 on the below-indicated date. The Express Mail No. has also been marked on the listed items.

Typed or printed name

Carly E. Taylor

Signature

Carly E. Taylor

Date

8/18/04

EV524133098

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS.



EV524133098

PTO/SB/17 (10-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 0.00

Complete if Known

Application Number 09/433,188

Filing Date Oct 25, 1999

First Named Inventor Neault

Examiner Name NGUYEN, THU HA T

Art Unit 2155

Attorney Docket No. MS1-311US

RECEIVED

AUG 24 2004

Technology Center 2100

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)☐ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None☒ Deposit Account:Deposit
Account
Number
Deposit
Account
Name

12-0769

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply)

☒ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☒ Credit any overpayments☒ Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s)☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.**FEE CALCULATION****1. BASIC FILING FEE**

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001 770	2001 385	Utility filing fee	
1002 340	2002 170	Design filing fee	
1003 530	2003 265	Plant filing fee	
1004 770	2004 385	Reissue filing fee	
1005 160	2005 80	Provisional filing fee	
SUBTOTAL (1)			(\$) 0.00

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

	Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid
Total Claims	-20** =	X	
Independent Claims	-3** =	X	
Multiple Dependent			

<u>Large Entity</u>		<u>Small Entity</u>		<u>Fee Description</u>
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20
1201	86	2201	43	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	290	2203	145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	86	2204	43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

FEE CALCULATION (continued)**3. ADDITIONAL FEES**

Large Entity Small Entity

Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051 130	2051 65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052 50	2052 25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053 130	1053 130	Non-English specification	
1812 2,520	1812 2,520	For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
1804 920*	1804 920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805 1,840*	1805 1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251 110	2251 55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252 420	2252 210	Extension for reply within second month	
1253 950	2253 475	Extension for reply within third month	
1254 1,480	2254 740	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255 2,010	2255 1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401 330	2401 165	Notice of Appeal	
1402 330	2402 165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403 290	2403 145	Request for oral hearing	
1451 1,510	1451 1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452 110	2452 55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453 1,330	2453 665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501 1,330	2501 665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502 480	2502 240	Design issue fee	
1503 640	2503 320	Plant issue fee	
1460 130	1460 130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807 50	1807 50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806 180	1806 180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021 40	8021 40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809 770	2809 385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810 770	2810 385	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801 770	2801 385	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802 900	1802 900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 0.00

SUBMITTED BY

Name (Print/Type) Frederick M. Fliegel

Registration No. 36,138
(Attorney/Agent)

(Complete if applicable)

Telephone (509) 324-9256

Signature


Date

Aug. 18, 2004

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



EV524133098

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No.:09/433,188
Filing Date:..... October 25, 1999
Inventors:..... D. Feinleib, et al.
Appellant:..... Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit:..... 2155
Examiner:..... T.H. Nguyen
Confirmation No.:..... 2227
Attorney's Docket No.:.....MS1-311US
Title: System and Method for Unified Registration Information Collection

APPEAL BRIEF

To: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patent
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

AUG 24 2004

Technology Center 2100

From: Frederick M. Fliegel, (509) 324-9256 x239
Customer No.: 22801

Sir:

With respect to the Final Office Action of December 18, 2003 in connection with the above-identified application, and further to the Notice of Appeal filed on March 18, 2004, an Appeal, corrected responsive to the Examiner's comments expressed in the Notice of Non-Compliance dated July 20, 2004, is enclosed herewith. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party part in interest in the present matter is the Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, WA, USA.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences known to the Appellant or the Appellant's undersigned representative that would directly affect, or be directly affected by, the outcome of the present Appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

The Final Office Action of December 18, 2003, states that Claims 1-18 and 20-42 are rejected. Claim 19 has been allowed. This Appeal is made to the rejection of Claims 1-18 and 20-42.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Subsequent to the Final Office Action of December 18, 2003, the Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 18, 2004.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The present invention is directed towards techniques for collecting and uploading user registration information. The present summary references the example system of Fig. 1 and the example process of Fig. 4 of the subject application.

As set forth in the “Summary of the Invention” on page 3 of the application, a client computer collects registration information and uploads the collected information to one or more remote registration databases. The collection and/or uploading of registration information for multiple manufacturers are performed in a unified manner, improving the user-friendly character of the computer.

Fig. 1 of the application illustrates an exemplary client computer 102 and multiple remote registration servers 104 and 106 in accordance with certain embodiments of the invention. Fig. 4 shows a flowchart illustrating an exemplary process for posting the collected registration information in accordance with further embodiments of the invention. The process of Fig. 4 may be performed in software. The description that follows will reference the processing blocks of Fig. 4 in parenthesis.

Referring to the system of Fig. 1, one or more registration wizards 120 at client computer 102 collect registration information for the manufacturers of components of client computer 102 (block 222). Communication between client computer 102 and registration servers 104 and 106 is established via communications network 114 (blocks 224 and 226). More particularly, via network 114, a first connection is established between client computer 102 and registration server 104 and a second connection is established between client computer 102 and registration server 106. Then, at least a first portion of the registration information is transmitted to registration server 104 via the first connection, and at least a second portion of the registration information is transmitted to registration server 106 via the second connection (block 228). If

there are no additional transfers (block 230), the registration process ends (block 232).

ISSUE

The issue presented for appeal is the rejection of Claims 1-18 and 20-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Darago, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,573; hereafter “Darago”) in view of Traversat, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,125; hereafter “Traversat”).

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The Appellant submits that the claims under appeal do not stand or fall together. The rejection presented in the Final Office Action is addressed below as it pertains to the following groups of claims.

- a. Claims 1, 3-7, 31, 32, 39, and 41;
- b. Claim 2
- c. Claims 8-13, 34, and 40;
- d. Claims 14-18, 20-22, 35, and 42;
- e. Claims 23-27 and 36;
- f. Claims 28 and 37; and
- g. Claims 29, 30, and 38.

ARGUMENT

a. The Appellant respectfully submits that Darago and Traversat do not render **Claim 1** obvious.

The method of Claim 1 comprises:

- establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network;
- establishing a first connection, via the communication link, to a first registration server of a plurality of registration servers;
- communicating at least a first portion of the registration information to the first registration server via the first connection;
- establishing a second connection, via the communication link, to a second registration server of the plurality of registration servers; and
- communicating at least a second portion of the registration information to the second registration server via the second connection.

It is acknowledged in the Final Office Action of December 18, 2003, that “Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer.” To compensate for the acknowledged deficiency of Darago, relative to the claimed invention, the rejection asserts that “Traversat teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer,” with support being attributed to Traversat, Figs. 6a-c, col. 3, lines 23 - col. 4, line 6, and col. 10, line 29 - col. 11, line 11.

However, Traversat does not disclose or suggest collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer as recited in Claim 1. In fact, none of the information on particular types of computers made by computer manufacturers mentioned in the above cited portions of Traversat includes any teaching that is even suggestive of collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer as recited in Claim 1.

More particularly, the Appellant submits that Traversat does not even contemplate collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer. Specifically, the cited portions of Traversat fail to teach or suggest collecting registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer, as recited in Claim 1. For instance, at col. 3, line 23 - col. 4, line 6, Traversat describes a data schema having a client schema sub-component and a server schema sub-component. The server schema is described as storing: user preferences and profiles; client computer platform and profile information; and persistent memory areas contain data entries having a name, related nodes, property names, and associated property values (col. 3, lines 23-35). Traversat also describes a data schema having a root node and intermediate nodes that represent or store categorical information relating to the computer network and client computer, and the schema also contains configuration information corresponding to the categorical information in the intermediate nodes (col. 3, lines 36-45 and 62-67). Thus, part of what Traversat lacks, relative to Claim 1, is any teaching that the data schemas described therein are suggestive of the collection of registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, set forth in MPEP §2143, have not all been met in the present rejection. More particularly, MPEP §2143 states, in part:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to

one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Appellant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Arguendo, even if Traversat did register information for manufacturers of components of a client computer, Darago and Traversat still lack any teaching or suggestion that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references.

The Final Office Action rationalizes the proposed combination stating, "because it would have an efficient communication system that client computer provides all the registration information software and hardware version to servers in order to make servers can communicate and provide appropriate and suitable information to client with different type of client's platform." This purported justification is not based upon any teaching by either Darago or Traversat, but rather is grounded in hindsight, which is an inappropriate basis for an obviousness rejection.

More particularly, page 1, lines 8-13, in the Background of the Invention portion of the subject application states:

...it is beneficial for the manufacturers of both the computers and the software the computers run to have information on the manner in which the computers and software are used, as well as information on the users of the computers and software. Having such information assists the manufacturers in designing and creating computers

and software that are more useful and better aligned with users' needs and desires.

The Appellant respectfully submits a comparison of the motivation to combine Darago and Traversat asserted in the rejection with the above Background description clearly shows that the motivation to combine has been provided by none other than the Appellant. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established in view of MPEP §2143, which states, "The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, not in the Appellant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of Darago and Traverat, and the corresponding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reversed.

Claims 3-7, 31, 32, 39, and 41 depend from Claim 1, and are therefore distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 1.

b. With regard to **Claim 2**, which depends from Claim 1, the Appellant notes that the rejection states that "Darago teaches the invention as claimed...including: establishing additional connections to additional registration servers of the plurality of registration servers via the communication link...; and communicating additional portions of the registration information to the additional registration servers."

The Appellant submits that, if Darago fails to “explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer,” as acknowledged in the rejection of Claim 1, then the same admitted deficiency also applies to Claim 2, which depends from Claim 1. That is, the Appellant submits that the rejection of Claim 2 is inconsistent with the rejection of Claim 1. Regardless, Claim 2 is distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 1, and the corresponding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reversed.

c. - g. The final rejection asserts identical arguments with regard to the remaining independent claims, including **Claims 8, 14, 23, 28, and 29**. Therefore, rejections c. – g. will be addressed together.

Specifically, the rejections for all of the above-identified independent claims state, *verbatim*:

Darago does not explicitly teach registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer. However, Traversat teaches the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer (figures 3, 6a-c, col. 3 lines 23 - col. 4 lines 6, col. 10, line 29 - col. 11 lines 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Darago and Traversat to have the step of registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer because it would have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

The Appellant does not agree that the above-identified independent claims are of such similar scope that they deserve to be rejected using the same generalized statements. Further, as asserted in the “Grouping of Claims”

(above), the independent claims of the subject application do not stand or fall together.

Regardless, for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding Claim 1, the Appellant respectfully submits that the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Darago and Traversat, as applied to remaining claim groups **c. through g.** should be reversed.

Furthermore, the proposed combination of Darago and Traversat do not teach or suggest the features of **Claim 8**, which comprises, in part:

collecting, using a registration wizard at a client computer, registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer.

That is, the proposed combination of Darago and Traversat lack, with regard to Claim 8, any teaching that the data schemas described therein are suggestive of the collection of registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer using a registration wizard, as recited in Claim 8.

Claims 9-13, 34 and 40 depend from Claim 8, and are therefore distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 1.

Claim 14 recites, in part:

collecting, using a single registration wizard at a client computer, registration information for a plurality of registering components of the client computer;

Again, the proposed combination of Darago and Traversat lacks any teaching that the data schemas described therein are suggestive of the collection of

registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer using a registration wizard, as recited in Claim 14.

Claims 15-18, 20-22, 35 and 42 depend from Claim 14, and are therefore distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 14.

Claim 23 recites, in part:

a registration wizard to collect registration information for a plurality of manufacturers of a plurality of components of a client computer; and

The proposed combination of Darago and Traversat lacks any teaching that the data schemas described therein are suggestive of a registration wizard to collect registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer using a registration wizard, as recited in Claim 23.

Claims 24-27 and 36 depend from Claim 23, and are therefore distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 23.

Claim 28 recites, in part:

a client computer, coupled to the network, to collect registration information for a plurality of manufacturers of components of the client computer using a single user interface and to upload portions of the registration information to registration databases of the plurality of registration databases via a single communication link.

The proposed combination of Darago and Traversat do not teach that the data schemas described therein are suggestive of a client computer to collect registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer using a single interface. Further, the final rejection does not even address the

further recitation of the client computer to upload portions of the registration information to registration databases of the plurality of registration databases via a single communication link, as recited in Claim 28.

Claim 37 depends from Claim 28, and is therefore distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 28.

Claim 29 recites, in part, instructions to:

collect registration information for
manufacturers of components of the apparatus.

The proposed combination of Darago and Traversat do not teach that the data schemas described therein are suggestive one or more instructions to collect registration information for manufacturers of components of a client computer using a single interface.

Claims 30 and 38 depend from Claim 29, and are therefore distinguishable over Darago and Traversat for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Claim 29.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons provided above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action of December 18, 2003, in connection with the subject application should be reversed.

Favorable consideration of this Brief is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE& HAYES, pllc

Aug 18, 2004


Frederick M. Fliegel
Registration No. 36,138

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside
Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform functions including:

collecting, using one or more registration wizards at a client computer, registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer;

establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network;

establishing a first connection, via the communication link, to a first registration server of a plurality of registration servers;

communicating at least a first portion of the registration information to the first registration server via the first connection;

establishing a second connection, via the communication link, to a second registration server of the plurality of registration servers; and

communicating at least a second portion of the registration information to the second registration server via the second connection.

2. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the program further causes the one or more processors to perform functions including:

establishing additional connections to additional registration servers of the plurality of registration servers via the communication link; and

communicating additional portions of the registration information to the additional registration servers.

3. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the first portion and the second portion share at least some common information.

4. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the first portion and the second portion are identical.

5. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information.

6. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the one or more registration wizards correspond to one or more software applications or hardware components.

7. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the establishing the first connection comprises establishing a first hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) connection, and wherein the establishing the second connection comprises establishing a second hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) connection.

8. A method comprising:

collecting, using a registration wizard at a client computer, registration information for manufacturers of components of the client computer;

establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network;

establishing a plurality of connections, via the communication link, between the client computer and a plurality of registration databases; and

communicating, for each of the plurality of connections, at least a portion of the registration information to one of the plurality of registration databases.

9. A method as recited in claim 8, wherein the communicating comprises communicating, for each of the plurality of connections, a different portion of the registration information to the one of the plurality of registration databases.

10. A method as recited in claim 9, wherein the different portions share at least some common information.

11. A method as recited in claim 8, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information.

12. A method as recited in claim 8, wherein the collecting comprises collecting the registration information for a plurality of software applications and hardware components.

13. One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 8.

14. A method comprising:
collecting, using a single registration wizard at a client computer, registration information for a plurality of registering components of the client computer;
establishing a plurality of connections between the client computer and a plurality of registration databases corresponding to manufacturers of the plurality of registering components; and
transferring at least a portion of the registration information to each of the plurality of registration databases via the plurality of connections.

15. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the plurality of registering components includes a software component and a hardware component.

16. A method as recited in claim 15, wherein the hardware component comprises the client computer.

17. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the plurality of registering components correspond on a one to one basis with the plurality of registration databases.

18. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the establishing a plurality of connections comprises:

establishing a communication link between the client computer and a network; and

subsequently establishing connections between the client computer and each of the plurality of registration databases via the communication link.

20. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the transferring comprises transferring different portions of the registration information to different ones of the plurality of registration databases.

21. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information.

22. One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 14.

23. A system comprising:

a registration wizard to collect registration information for a plurality of manufacturers of a plurality of components of a client computer; and
one or more posting modules, coupled to the registration wizard, to,
establish a plurality of connections between the client computer and a plurality of registration databases corresponding to the plurality of manufacturers, and
transfer at least a portion of the registration information to each of the plurality of registration databases via the plurality of connections.

24. A system as recited in claim 23, wherein the plurality of manufacturers include one or more of software application designers, hardware component manufacturers, and the system manufacturer.

25. A system as recited in claim 23, wherein the plurality of manufacturers correspond on a one to one basis with the plurality of registration databases.

26. A system as recited in claim 23, wherein the one or more posting modules are further to transfer different portions of the registration information to different ones of the plurality of registration databases.

27. A system as recited in claim 23, wherein the registration information includes one or more of user demographic information and client computer information.

28. A system comprising:

a plurality of server computers coupled to a network, each being coupled to at least one of a plurality of registration databases to store registration information received by the server computer; and

a client computer, coupled to the network, to collect registration information for a plurality of manufacturers of components of the client computer using a single user interface and to upload portions of the registration information to registration databases of the plurality of registration databases via a single communication link.

29. An apparatus comprising:

a bus;

a processor coupled to the bus;

a network connection device coupled to the bus; and

a memory, coupled to the bus, to store a plurality of instructions that are executed by the processor, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed, cause the processor to,

collect registration information for manufacturers of components of the apparatus,

initiate, using the network connection device, a communication link to a network,

establish, via the communication link, a plurality of connections between the apparatus and a plurality of registration databases, and

communicate, for each of the plurality of connections, at least a portion of the registration information to one of the plurality of registration databases.

30. An apparatus as recited in claim 29, wherein the plurality of instructions that, when executed, cause the processor to collect registration information further cause the processor to collect one or more of user demographic information and client computer information.

31. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the components comprise software components.

32. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the components comprise hardware components.

33. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the components comprise both one or more hardware components and one or more software components.

34. A method as recited in claim 8, wherein the components comprise both one or more hardware components and one or more software components.

35. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the plurality of registering components comprises both one or more hardware components and one or more software components.

36. A system as recited in claim 23, wherein the plurality of components comprises both one or more hardware components and one or more software components.

37. A system as recited in claim 28, wherein the components comprise both one or more hardware components and one or more software components.

38. An apparatus as recited in claim 29, wherein the components comprise both one or more hardware components and one or more software components.

39. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the first registration server corresponds to a manufacturer of an operating system executing on the client computer, and wherein the second registration server corresponds to a manufacturer of the client computer.

40. A method as recited in claim 8, wherein one of the plurality of registration databases corresponds to a manufacturer of an operating system executing on the client computer, and wherein another of the plurality of registration databases corresponds to a manufacturer of the client computer.

41. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the collecting comprises accessing a plurality of registration documents to identify which registration information to collect.

42. A method as recited in claim 14, wherein the collecting comprises accessing a plurality of registration documents to identify which registration information to collect.

END OF DOCUMENT